

REMARKS:

Claim 1 is withdrawn. This does not denote any abandonment of matter in the application, in particular for methods of use which did referenced claim 1. The claims are limited to a number of species in order to allow for the examination to proceed maintaining unity of the invention.

Claim 3 is withdrawn to reduce the number of claims. This does not denote any abandonment of matter within the application.

Claim 4 is made dependent upon claim 2 and no longer requires to mention the species as example which could have made it not definite.

Claim 5, 6, 8 and 9 are made dependent upon claim 2.

Claim 10 is amended to introduce the list of species in order to maintain the unity of invention. This does not denote any abandonment of matter within the application.

Claim 12 is a method of use of the product which is made dependant upon claim 2 in order to ensure unity of invention. This does not denote any abandonment of matter in the application.

Claims 13-17 are UNCHANGED dependent of claim 12: We believe that as dependent claims of claim 12, they pertain to group I.

Claim 19 is made dependant of claim 2 to ensure unity of invention: This does not denote any abandonment of matter in the application.

Claim 20 to 24 are UNCHANGED.

Claims 25 to 39 are NEW dependent claims upon claim 2 and aimed at individual species. We believe that they pertains to group I.

Claims 40 is a NEW dependent claim to claim 12 and further characterizes the method of use in that the “entangled” sample is prepared according to the steps described in the application. We believe that it pertains to group I.